

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Alexis Carberry,

Plaintiff,

v.

Darlington County School district  
Represented; Tim Newman *individ.*,  
Carla Jefferson *individ.*,  
Brian P. Murphy *individ.*

Defendants.

Case No. 0:24-cv-01991-JDA

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the Magistrate Judge. [Doc. 7.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges for pre-trial proceedings.

On May 1, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the case be summarily dismissed without leave for further amendment because it is duplicative of another pending action filed by Plaintiff, *Carberry v. Darlington County*, No. 0:23-04565-JDA. [Doc. 7.] The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if she failed to do so. [*Id.* at 7.] Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report

of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, the action is DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance and service of process, and Plaintiff’s pending motion for permanent injunction and for appointment of counsel [Doc. 3] is FOUND AS MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin  
United States District Judge

August 6, 2024  
Columbia, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.